

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated October 18, 2005. Claims 1-14 were examined in the Office Action. Claims 1-14 were rejected. Independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 have been amended to clarify distinctive features. New claims 15-20 have been added to provide claims of varying scope than those initially filed.

Examination and reconsideration based on this Amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 1 has been amended to comply with the Examiner's suggestion of changing the claim to overcome this rejection. Claims 2-4 depend from amended independent claim 1 and are thus rendered as statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by "CAT Bobby: Manual for Downloadable Version 2000" (hereinafter "Bobby"), copyright 19969-2000 Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST). Applicants respectfully submit that Bobby does not teach each and every feature of amended claim 1.

Amended claim 1 is drawn to a computer-executable method of testing a hypertext document for compliance with a selected criterion. The method comprises, among other features, accepting a user selection of the selected criterion and user input of at least one parameter indicative of compliance with the selected criterion for an analysis of the hypertext document. In contrast, Bobby discloses browser compatibility tests where selection of a settings button will cause the rendering of a dialog box. The dialog box allows a user to select all the browsers for which the user desires Bobby to test a page for compatibility. However, Bobby fails to disclose or suggest accepting a user input of a parameter indicative of compliance with the selected criterion for an analysis. Selection of one or more browsers for browser compatibility testing does not disclose or suggest inputting a parameter that indicates compliance

with the one or more selected browsers. (See Bobby, page 11, 12, &13). Thus, amended claim 1 is allowable over Bobby.

Dependent Claims

At least because dependent claims 2-4 depend from amended claim 1, claims 2-4 are also allowable over Bobby.

Claim 4

Amended claim 4 is drawn to the method of claim 1 after the step of performing the analysis. The method further comprises, among other features, performing the analysis of another hypertext document linked to the hypertext document and generating analysis data, the analysis data comprising an indication of whether the other hypertext document is in compliance with the selected criterion. Here presenting at least a portion of the analysis comprises presenting compiled summary information about a collection of hypertext documents comprising the hypertext document and the other hypertext document thereby identifying what criterion is most problematic with the collection.

In contrast, although Bobby discloses a report for reviewing and a summary report, the reports either only reports data on a per page basis or only covers access errors and not compliance errors. (See Bobby pages 8 and 10). Thus, Bobby fails to disclose presenting compiled summary information about a collection of hypertext documents thereby identifying what criterion is most problematic with the collection as recited in claim 4. Therefore claim 4 is allowable over Bobby for at least this reason also.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bobby as applied to claims 1-4 above, and further in view of Nentwich et al. (hereinafter "Nentwich"), "xlinkit: A Consistency Checking and Smart Link Generation Service", ACM Transactions on Internet Technology, Vol. 2, No. 2, May 2002, p. 151-185. Applicants respectfully submit that Bobby does not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claims 5, 9, and 13.

Claims 5 and 9

Applicants' amended independent claims 5 and 9 are drawn to a method of testing a hypertext document for compliance with a selected criterion. The methods comprise, among other features, accepting a user selection of the selected criterion and a user input at a client terminal, the user input having at least one parameter indicative of compliance with the selected criterion for an analysis of the hypertext document. As described above with respect to claim 1, Bobby does not disclose or suggest accepting a user input of a parameter indicative of compliance with the selected criterion for an analysis. Selection of one or more browsers for browser compatibility testing does not disclose or suggest inputting a parameter that indicates compliance with the one or more selected browsers. (See Bobby, page 11, 12, &13). Claim 5 also comprises, among other features, transmitting the user selection and the user input to a server, the server having a rules engine component for analyzing the hypertext document based on the user selection and the user input. As described above, Bobby does not disclose or suggest a rules engine component for analyzing the hypertext document based on a parameter indicative of compliance with the selected criterion for an analysis as recited in amended claim 5. Thus, neither Bobby nor Nentwich alone, or in combination, teach or suggest amended claims 5 and 9. Therefore claims 5 and 9 are allowable over Bobby in view of Nentwich.

Claim 13

Applicants' amended independent claim 13 is drawn to a server operational to test a hypertext document for compliance with a selected criterion. The server comprises, among other features, a user interface operational to receive a user selection of the selected criterion and user input of at least one parameter indicative of compliance with the selected criterion for an analysis of the hypertext document. As described above with respect to claim 1, Bobby does not disclose or suggest a user interface operational to receive a user selection of the selected criterion and user input of at least one parameter indicative of compliance with the selected criterion as recited in claim 13. Selection of one or more browsers for browser compatibility testing does not disclose or suggest inputting a parameter that indicates compliance with the one or more selected browsers. (See Bobby, page 11, 12, &13). Thus, neither Bobby nor Nentwich alone, or in combination, teach or suggest amended claim 13. Therefore claim 13 is allowable over Bobby in view of Nentwich.

Dependent Claims


At least because claims 6-8, 10-12, and 14 inherit the language of amended claims 5, 9, and 13 respectively, claims 6-8, 10-12, and 14 are also allowable over Bobby in view of Nentwich.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5100



Date: January 18, 2006

Murrell W. Blackburn
Reg. No. 50,881

